



**QUEEN'S  
UNIVERSITY  
BELFAST**

## Lung clearance index in adults and children with cystic fibrosis

O'Neill, K., Tunney, M. M., Johnston, E., Rowan, S., Downey, D. G., Rendall, J., Reid, A., Bradbury, I., Elborn, J. S., & Bradley, J. M. (2016). Lung clearance index in adults and children with cystic fibrosis. *Chest*, 150(6), 1323-1332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2016.06.029>

**Published in:**  
Chest

**Document Version:**  
Peer reviewed version

**Queen's University Belfast - Research Portal:**  
[Link to publication record in Queen's University Belfast Research Portal](#)

### **Publisher rights**

12 months embargo

© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/> which permits distribution and reproduction for non-commercial purposes, provided the author and source are cited.

### **General rights**

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Queen's University Belfast Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

### **Take down policy**

The Research Portal is Queen's institutional repository that provides access to Queen's research output. Every effort has been made to ensure that content in the Research Portal does not infringe any person's rights, or applicable UK laws. If you discover content in the Research Portal that you believe breaches copyright or violates any law, please contact [openaccess@qub.ac.uk](mailto:openaccess@qub.ac.uk).

Word count

Abstract: 248/250

Text: 3347/2500

Title: Lung clearance index in adults and children with cystic fibrosis

Authors: Katherine O'Neill PhD<sup>1¶</sup>, Michael M. Tunney PhD<sup>2</sup>, Elinor Johnston PhD<sup>1</sup>, Stephen Rowan PhD, MD<sup>3</sup>, Damian G. Downey MD<sup>4</sup>, Jacqueline Rendall, MD<sup>4</sup>, Alastair Reid MD<sup>4</sup>, Ian Bradbury PhD<sup>5</sup>, J. Stuart Elborn PhD, MD<sup>1¶</sup>, Judy. M. Bradley PhD<sup>6¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Infection and Immunity, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>School of Pharmacy, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>3</sup>South Eastern Health and Social Care Trust, Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup>Belfast Health and Social Care Trust, Belfast, United Kingdom

<sup>5</sup>Frontier Science (Scotland) Ltd, United Kingdom

<sup>6</sup>Clinical Research Facility, Queen's University Belfast, United Kingdom

¶These authors equally contributed to this work.

Corresponding author: Katherine O'Neill. Centre for Infection and Immunity, 3rd Floor, Medical Biology Centre, Lisburn Road, Queen's University Belfast, BT9 7BL. Email: k.oneill@qub.ac.uk.

This work was funded by the Health and Social Care Research and Development Division, Public Health Agency, Northern Ireland and the Medical Research Council through a US-Ireland Partnership Grant.

KON, MMT, JSE and JB have received grant support from the Northern Ireland Research and Development Division, EU Framework 7 and the Medical Research Council to support this work. All others declare no conflicts of interest.

## **Abstract**

**Background:** Lung clearance index (LCI) has good clinimetric properties and an acceptable feasibility profile as a surrogate endpoint in Cystic Fibrosis (CF). Although most studies to date have been in children, increasing numbers of adults with CF also have normal spirometry. Further study of LCI as an endpoint in CF adults is required. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to determine the clinimetric properties of LCI over the complete age range of people with CF.

**Methods:** Clinically stable adults and children with CF and age matched healthy controls were recruited.

**Results:** LCI and spirometry data for 110 CF subjects and 61 controls were collected at a stable visit. CF Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R) was completed by 80/110 CF subjects. Fifty-six CF subjects completed a second stable visit. The LCI CV% was 4.1% in adults and 6.3% in children with CF. The coefficient of repeatability of LCI was 1.2 in adults and 1.3 in children. In both adults and children, LCI ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.93$  and  $0.84$ ) had greater combined sensitivity and specificity to discriminate between people with CF and controls compared to  $FEV_1$  ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.88$  and  $0.60$ ) and  $FEF_{25-75}$  ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.87$  and  $0.68$ ). LCI correlated significantly with the CFQ-R treatment burden in adults ( $r=-0.37$ ;  $p<0.01$ ) and children ( $r=-0.50$ ;  $p<0.01$ ). Washout tests were successful in 90% of CF subjects and were perceived as comfortable and easy to perform in both adults and children.

**Conclusions:** These data support the use of LCI as a surrogate outcome measure in CF clinical trials in adults as well as children.

## Introduction

Lung clearance index (LCI), a measure of ventilation inhomogeneity derived from multiple breath washout (MBW), has good clinimetric properties and an acceptable feasibility profile as a surrogate endpoint in CF<sup>1, 2</sup>. The majority of studies have been in children<sup>2</sup> where it has most potential as a useful marker to detect early changes in lung disease. These studies have shown good short- and medium-term repeatability of LCI in health and disease<sup>3-6</sup> and correlation with parameters of chest Computed Tomography (CT)<sup>7-9</sup>, body plethysmography<sup>10</sup>, spirometry (forced expiratory volume in 1 second [FEV<sub>1</sub>], forced expiratory flow<sub>25-75</sub> [FEF<sub>25-75</sub>])<sup>11, 12</sup> and markers of pulmonary inflammation and infection<sup>3</sup>. LCI has also been shown to be more sensitive than FEV<sub>1</sub> in predicting<sup>11</sup> and detecting<sup>4, 13, 14</sup> early lung disease. In addition, LCI predicts pulmonary exacerbations and correlates with respiratory symptoms as measured by the CF Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R)<sup>15</sup>. The responsiveness of LCI in children with CF has also been demonstrated post intervention with hypertonic saline<sup>6, 16</sup>, DNase<sup>17</sup> and in children and adults receiving ivacaftor<sup>18</sup>. Furthermore, MBW testing is considered feasible in an outpatient setting<sup>5</sup>.

Studies of LCI involving adults with CF have also demonstrated encouraging results but are fewer in number<sup>8, 19-22</sup>. As increasing numbers of adult patients with CF also have normal FEV<sub>1</sub>, more sensitive endpoints are required to assess new therapies in this age group<sup>23</sup>. Improved survival means that adults are beginning to outnumber children in most developed countries<sup>24</sup> and a large proportion of clinical trials are aimed at adults where efficacy must be demonstrated prior to testing treatments in younger patients. A recent workshop report has highlighted the potential use for LCI in older subjects with normal FEV<sub>1</sub><sup>25</sup> however gaps in the current evidence remain concerning inter-visit reliability, correlation with patient reported outcomes and patient acceptability. Furthermore, only one study has directly compared adults and children with CF<sup>26</sup>. Further research is required to validate LCI as outcome measure across the age range in CF.

In this study we determined the intra-visit repeatability, sensitivity and specificity and inter-visit repeatability of LCI compared with FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub>. We also assessed the correlations between LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub>, FEF<sub>25-75</sub> and CFQ-R domain scores and determined the feasibility and acceptability of LCI. Results were reported separately for adults and children with CF. Some results of this work have been presented in abstract format<sup>27-29</sup>.

## Methods

Adults and children with CF were recruited as part of a larger study investigating the prevalence and potential pathogenicity of anaerobic bacteria in CF lung disease. CF subjects were recruited during routine outpatient appointments at the adult and paediatric CF Centres, Belfast Health and Social Care Trust (Belfast City Hospital and Royal Belfast Hospital for Sick Children). All subjects were enrolled for the first study visit when clinically stable (cross-sectional arm). Subjects were aged  $\geq 6$  years, had a confirmed diagnosis of CF<sup>30</sup> and were clinically stable (with no pulmonary exacerbation requiring intravenous antibiotics in the previous 4 weeks). A subgroup of subjects' ( $\geq 12$  years) were recruited to a longitudinal arm in which repeat stable visits were performed at 3 monthly intervals. Due to the difficulties of collecting sputum samples from subjects  $< 12$  years old, these subjects participated in the cross-sectional study only. The current study reports on MBW, spirometry and questionnaire data only.

An exclusion criterion for MBW testing specifically was infection with *Burkholderia cepacia* complex infection (due to equipment infection control issues). On obtaining written informed consent, subjects were enrolled for a study visit and completed a CFQ-R, a MBW test, 2 Visual Analogue Scales (VAS) for evaluating the ease and comfort with MBW testing and spirometry. For the second stable visit, procedures were completed in the same order.

Adult and child healthy control (HC) subjects were invited to attend a single study visit by means of email circulation amongst work colleagues at Queen's University Belfast and Belfast Health and Social Care Trust. Subjects were aged  $\geq 6$  years, had no history of a respiratory condition or use of antibiotics in the previous 4 weeks. On obtaining written informed consent, subjects completed spirometry and a MBW test.

All subjects were recruited during a 32-month period (October 2010-June 2013). This study was approved by the Office for Research Ethics Committees Northern Ireland (reference number: 10/NIR01/41).

Participants individually completed an age-appropriate version of the CFQ-R before any other procedure. Children aged 6-11 years old completed the questionnaire with the assistance of the researcher or a parent if necessary. Adolescent and adult data for subjects aged  $\geq 14$  years old was collected in 1 version of the questionnaire and child data for subjects aged 6-13 years old in another version.

The MBW test to measure LCI was performed using the modified Innocor<sup>TM</sup> device as previously validated<sup>19</sup> (e-Appendix 1). The test was performed either before or at least 30 minutes after performing spirometry to try to avoid any effects of a forced manoeuvre on LCI. Analysis of MBW data was performed using the Simple Washout programme. Three tests were attempted and the mean LCI was calculated from a minimum of 2 technically valid and

repeatable tests (e-Appendix 1). The upper limit of normal (ULN) for LCI was calculated from the cohort of healthy controls (mean LCI + 1.96 SD). Z-scores were also calculated from HC group values. An LCI z-score of  $>2$  was considered abnormal. Feasibility of MBW was assessed as the number of successful test sessions/attempted test sessions.

Two VAS were completed at the first stable visit to score perceived comfort and ease in carrying out the MBW test. The VAS consisted of a scale from 0 to 10 cm with zero representing not comfortable/not easy and 10 representing extremely comfortable/extremely easy (e-Appendix 2).

Spirometry was measured according to ATS/ERS guidelines<sup>31</sup> using a MicroLab (ML3500 MK8) spirometer (CareFusion, Kent, UK). Predicted values were calculated from reference ranges for all ages<sup>32</sup>. The lower limit of normal of 80% for FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> was used, as this is the level that is historically used in clinical practice. Z-scores were also calculated from HC group values. A FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> z-score of  $<-2$  was considered abnormal.

### *Statistical analysis*

Data were analysed using PASW Statistics (version 18, IBM software, USA) and Prism (Version 5.01 GraphPad Software Inc.). Intra-visit repeatability was assessed using the coefficient of variation (CV %) (i.e. within subject SD/mean) of triplicate LCI readings. In addition, Bland-Altman plots (i.e. the 95% limits of agreement between the first and third washout tests) were inspected. A learned effect if present, would most likely be apparent between the 1st and 3<sup>rd</sup> test. Finally, the coefficient of repeatability (CoR) (i.e.  $1.96 \times \text{SD of the differences}$ ) was calculated and compared to CoR and within subject differences (considered to represent a significant change) reported in the literature (0.96 to 1.30 in children and adults with CF<sup>5,33,34</sup>). Subjects with only 2 washout repeats were excluded from intra-visit repeatability analysis. The sensitivity (proportion of true positives who are test positive) and specificity (the proportion of true negatives who are test positive) of LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> to the presence of CF, was assessed in the adult and child groups. Receiver-operator characteristic (ROC) curves (Area under the Curve [AUC<sup>ROC</sup>] and Standard Error [SE]) for LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> were used to assess combined sensitivity and specificity. ROC curves were compared using a Venkatraman's test<sup>35</sup>. In a subgroup, the long-term inter-visit repeatability across 2 stable visits was assessed using Bland-Altman plots and the interclass correlation coefficient (ICC) and 95% confidence intervals (CI). Correlations were assessed

using Pearson's correlation coefficient. Differences between means were assessed using paired t-tests. A p-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant.

## Results

### *Participants and data collected*

e-Figure 1 describes study recruitment for subjects with CF. 122 subjects with CF were enrolled and completed the first stable visit. LCI results from 6 subjects were not repeatable and 6 subjects were unable to complete the MBW procedure; one experienced discomfort with the mouthpiece, 5 did not have time to complete a minimum of 2 tests. Therefore, data from 110 subjects with CF (n=43 children) was used for analysis. Fifty-six subjects (n=12 children) completed a second stable visit ( $\geq 3$  months later).

e-Figure 2 describes study recruitment for healthy subjects. Data from 61 subjects (n=31 children) were included in the analysis. Adult and child results were analysed and presented separately. All subject characteristics are displayed in Table 1.

### *Intra-visit repeatability*

In the adult group, the LCI CV% was not significantly different between CF and HC groups. However, the LCI CV% was significantly different between children with CF and HC and was higher in children with CF compared with adults with CF (Table 1). The Bland-Altman plots (Figures 1a and b) show that there was no evidence of greater variability in subjects with more advanced disease in the CF adult or child group. The CoR (1.2 in CF adults and 1.3 in CF children) was equivalent to 12% of the mean LCI value in CF adults and 17% of the mean LCI value in CF children (Table 2). The age, gender and spirometry of patients included in this analysis (3 washout repeats) did not differ significantly from those excluded from the analysis (2 washout repeats) (e-Table 1).

### *Sensitivity and specificity*

The ULN of LCI (mean LCI plus 1.96 SD) for adults was 7.5 and 7.3 for children. All control subjects had an LCI < the ULN. Whilst LCI had a narrow range in healthy controls, LCI increased with declining FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted in both CF adult ( $r=-0.68$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ) (e-Figure 3) and CF child ( $r=-0.66$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ) subjects (e-Figure 4). LCI also increased with declining FEF<sub>25-75</sub>% predicted in both CF adult ( $r=-0.59$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ) (e-Figure 5) and CF child ( $r=-0.48$ ,  $p<0.0001$ ) subjects (e-Figure 6).

In adult subjects the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to CF was 81% and 100%, respectively compared to 63% and 100% for FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted and 80% and 63% for FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted. Considering CF subjects only, 14/67 (21%) CF adults had an abnormal LCI and a normal FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted. Two CF adults (3%) had a normal LCI and an abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted (e-Figure 3). Seven (12%) CF adults had an abnormal LCI and a normal FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted. Four CF adults (7%) had a normal LCI and an abnormal FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted (e-Figure 5). Overall, in adults LCI ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.93$ ;  $SE=0.03$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) had greater combined sensitivity and specificity to discriminate between CF and controls compared to FEV<sub>1</sub>% predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.88$ ;  $SE=0.03$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.87$ ;  $SE=0.04$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) (Figure 2a). Comparison of the ROC curves showed that LCI  $AUC^{ROC}$  was only significantly better than FEF<sub>25-75</sub>  $AUC^{ROC}$  ( $p=0.02$ ) but not FEV<sub>1</sub>  $AUC^{ROC}$  ( $p=0.12$ ). LCI had significant sensitivity and specificity to detect abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.91$ ;  $SE=0.03$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.81$ ;  $SE=0.05$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) in adults (e-Figure 7 and 8).

In the child subjects, the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to CF was 46% and 100% respectively compared to 31% and 81% for FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted and 70% and 55% for FEF<sub>25-75</sub>. Considering CF subjects only, 8/43 (19%) children had an abnormal LCI in the presence of a normal FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted. Four (9%) children had a normal LCI and an abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted (e-Figure 4). Three (7%) CF children had an abnormal LCI and a normal FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted. Twelve CF children (28%) had a normal LCI and an abnormal FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted (e-Figure 6). Overall, in children LCI ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.84$ ;  $SE=0.05$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) had greater combined sensitivity and specificity to discriminate between CF and controls compared to FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.68$ ;  $SE=0.07$ ;  $p=0.02$ ). FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.60$ ;  $SE=0.07$ ;  $p=0.15$ ) was not statistically significant in discriminating between CF and HC child subjects (Figure 2b). Comparison of the ROC curves showed that LCI  $AUC^{ROC}$  was significantly better than FEV<sub>1</sub>  $AUC^{ROC}$  ( $p=0.0002$ ) and FEF<sub>25-75</sub>  $AUC^{ROC}$  ( $p=0.03$ ). LCI also had significant sensitivity and specificity to detect abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.77$ ;  $SE=0.07$ ;  $p<0.0001$ ) and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted ( $AUC^{ROC}=0.69$ ;  $SE=0.06$ ;  $p<0.007$ ) (e-Figure 9 and 10) in children.

#### *Inter-visit repeatability*

Fifty-six CF subjects (n=12 children) completed a second stable visit that included MBW testing (Table 1). Due to smaller numbers completing 2 stable visits, data from adults and



children were combined for analysis. Visits were on average (SD) [range] 213 (114) [67-614] days apart.

There was no significant difference between repeat measurements across an average period of 8 months (e-Table 2). The ICC (95% CI) for LCI (0.96; 0.94 to 0.98;  $p<0.0001$ ), FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted (0.91; 0.84 to 0.94;  $p<0.0001$ ) and FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted (0.91; 0.85 to 0.95;  $p<0.0001$ ) all demonstrated excellent agreement with statistical significance.

#### *Correlations with CFQ-R domain scores*

Of the 110 CF subjects, 80 completed the CFQ-R at their first stable visit consisting of 55 adolescents/adults ( $\geq 14$  years old) and 25 children (6-13 years). Domain scores for CFQ-R adolescent/adult ( $\geq 14$  years), CFQ-R child (6-13 years) are summarised in e-Table 3. Table 3 summarises the correlation coefficients between the CFQ-R domains scores, LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub> and FEF<sub>25-75</sub>. Significant correlations were observed with CFQ-R treatment burden only (e-Figure 11 and e-Figure 12). The relationship between CFQ-R respiratory symptoms and LCI and between CFQ-R respiratory symptoms and spirometry were not significant.

#### *Feasibility and acceptability*

Of the 122 CF subjects recruited, 110 (90%) of MBW tests were successful with a minimum of 2 technically valid and repeatable tests obtained.

All but 1 of the 110 CF subjects completed both VAS (child aged 6 years unable to understand the instructions). Both adults and children reported high levels of comfort (mean VAS score [SD] 8.0 [1.5] Vs. 8.2 [1.8];  $p=0.39$ ) and ease (mean VAS score [SD] 9.0 [1.3] Vs. 9.0 [1.7];  $p=0.94$ ) with the MBW test and there was no significant difference between scores in the 2 age groups.

## **Discussion**

This study demonstrates that LCI has good clinimetric properties over a wide age range in CF subjects from school age to older adulthood. Considering intra-visit repeatability of LCI, the within-visit CV% for CF subjects was better in the adult group (4.1%) compared with the child group (6.3%). Both results were comparable to within-visit CV% of 4-8% reported in recent studies<sup>3, 5, 12</sup> and in a study using the same MBW device<sup>19</sup>. Adult and child CF subjects had similar intra-visit variability in LCI compared with their HC counterparts, with no significant difference in the mean differences between the first and third tests. The CoR (1.2 in CF adults and 1.3 in CF children) was similar to levels considered to represent significant change in recent

trials (0.96-1.30)<sup>5, 11, 34</sup>. The CoR statistic is useful to indicate the degree of variability above which a treatment effect would be expected to be observed<sup>36</sup>; however caution is required with respect to the direct interpretation of CoR as the level of treatment effect. This statistic confounds individual level changes, only measuring within-subject variation. In order to obtain a more meaningful threshold for treatment effect, an assessment of how much change is required for the patient to report benefit may be more informative. Importantly, the Bland-Altman plots demonstrate that there is no evidence of increased variation within washouts in subjects with more severely impaired lung function (i.e. a higher LCI) across both the adult and child CF groups. However, as the analysis protocol applied its own repeatability criteria (excluding those subjects who had an FRC > 10% and/or an LCI of >20% across  $\geq 2$  tests), this cohort of CF subjects represent the “best” subjects in terms of intra-visit repeatability. These criteria may inadvertently exclude subjects with more severe lung function and therefore a more variable LCI. Nevertheless, these data suggest that levels of variation in LCI are relatively stable in subjects with an LCI of up to 17.2 lung turnovers. A potential limitation of the study relates to the timing of MBW during the study visit which was performed before or 30 minutes after spirometry. This schedule was in place to minimise disruption for the patient and to ensure that data collection for the study could take place during a routine outpatient appointment. However, previous studies have shown little to no short term impact on LCI as a result of forced manoeuvres<sup>37, 38</sup>.

This was the first study to investigate the longer term stability (> three months) of LCI in those with stable disease. Other studies assessing intra-visit repeatability in children performed repeat sessions up to a maximum of 12 weeks apart<sup>6</sup>. The results from this analysis indicated good long-term repeatability of LCI with stability of measurements across an average period of eight months. This data addresses an important question around the clinimetrics of LCI as a surrogate measure of lung function, providing evidence that LCI has low levels of variation in a combined adult and child group comparable with spirometry over a long-term period.

This study also demonstrates that LCI has excellent sensitivity and specificity ( $AUC^{ROC}$ ) when discriminating between CF and HC subjects across the age range. LCI  $AUC^{ROC}$  was significantly better than  $FEF_{25-75}$   $AUC^{ROC}$  in adults and both  $FEV_1$   $AUC^{ROC}$  and  $FEF_{25-75}$   $AUC^{ROC}$  in children. A proportion of CF subjects in both age groups had an abnormal LCI in the presence of normal  $FEV_1$  (21% in adults; 19% in children) or a normal  $FEF_{25-75}$  (12% in adults and 7% in children).  $FEF_{25-75}$  had equal (adults) or better (children) sensitivity

than LCI but was much less specific. In children, FEF<sub>25-75</sub> detected a proportion of subjects (30%) with an abnormal reading in the presence of a normal LCI. Given that LCI is reflective of ventilation distribution in both small and large airways, perhaps normal gas mixing in the large airways masked abnormality in the small airways in these patients. However, almost half of healthy subjects also had an abnormal FEF<sub>25-75</sub> which highlights that this measure was not specific to disease in this group and perhaps not reliable. The limitation of FEV<sub>1</sub> was highlighted specifically in the child group where the values were well preserved and therefore did not differentiate well between health and disease. The adult data specifically highlights that an abnormal LCI in the presence of a normal FEV<sub>1</sub> can range from mildly abnormal to grossly increased values, indicating that even advanced ventilation inhomogeneity may not be detected by FEV<sub>1</sub> or FEF<sub>25-75</sub>.

The domain of treatment burden emerged as an important aspect of health related quality of life in this study, correlating with LCI and FEV<sub>1</sub> in both age groups and with FEF<sub>25-75</sub> in adults. The association between LCI, spirometry and CFQ-R respiratory symptoms were not significant in this study, unlike those reported in children by Vermeulen and colleagues<sup>15</sup>. In this study, patients with grossly elevated LCI (>10 z-scores) reported respiratory symptoms within the same range as those patients who had moderately elevated LCI z-scores, diminishing the association. A possible reason why treatment burden was important in this study may be due to the significant treatment demands placed on subjects with CF which may be increasing with the emergence of new and more aggressive therapies. Previous studies of patient perceived treatment burden have shown it to be independent of disease severity<sup>39</sup>. In this study it significantly correlated with the respiratory symptoms domain in the adult group ( $r=0.36$ ;  $p=0.006$ ), indicating that a higher treatment burden was associated with more symptoms and likely, more severe disease. Overall, the significant correlations observed were of weak to moderate strength ( $r= -0.37$  to  $-0.50$ ) however, they are similar to those reported in the initial validation studies of the CFQ-R with FEV<sub>1</sub> ( $r= 0.23$  to  $0.45$ )<sup>40</sup>.

Reported success rates for achieving valid and repeatable tests have ranged from 24 - 100%; however, the majority are >70%, given adequate time to ensure collection of valid data (2 to 3 tests)<sup>5, 41</sup>. A drawback of the test is that sessions can often take > 30 minutes for each individual. Our finding that MBW tests were feasible to perform (90% success rate) and that child and adult subjects with CF found the MBW to be equally acceptable adds to the current feasibility profile of LCI.

## **Conclusions**

This study shows that the clinimetric properties of LCI (validity reliability, sensitivity, specificity, feasibility and acceptability) in adults with CF are comparable to those in children with CF. These data support the use of LCI as a surrogate outcome measure in CF clinical trials in adults as well as children.

## **Acknowledgements**

Author's contributions: KO'N, M.M.T. and J.S.E. and J.M.B conceived and designed research; K.O'N and E.J recruited patients, collected clinical data and performed the assessments; K.O'N, M.M.T, S.R, I.B, J.S.E and J.M.B analysed data; S.R, D.G.D, J.R and A.R provided intellectual contributions; K.O'N, J.M.B, M.M.T and J.S.E. wrote the paper.

KO'N and J.S.E. take responsibility for (is the guarantor of) the content of the manuscript, including the data and analysis.

We would like to thank Dr Alex Horsley (University of Manchester) and Dr Nick Bell (Department of Respiratory Medicine, Bristol Royal Infirmary) for permission to use the modified Innocor™ device standard operating procedure and the Simple Washout programme for the analysis of MBW data. We would like to thank the patients and families who participated in this study.

## References

- 1 Fuchs SI, Gappa M. Lung clearance index: clinical and research applications in children. *Paediatric Respiratory Reviews*. 2011;12(4):264-270.
- 2 Kent L, Reix P, Innes JA et al. Lung clearance index: Evidence for use in clinical trials in cystic fibrosis. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2014;13(2):123-138.
- 3 Belessis Y, Dixon B, Hawkins G et al. Early cystic fibrosis lung disease detected by bronchoalveolar lavage and lung clearance index. *American journal of respiratory and critical care medicine*. 2012;185(8):862-873.
- 4 Aurora P, Gustafsson P, Bush A et al. Multiple breath inert gas washout as a measure of ventilation distribution in children with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax*. 2004;59(12):1068-1073.
- 5 Singer F, Kieninger E, Abbas C et al. Practicability of nitrogen multiple-breath washout measurements in a pediatric cystic fibrosis outpatient setting. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2013;48(8):739-746.
- 6 Amin R, Subbarao P, Jabar A et al. Hypertonic saline improves the LCI in paediatric patients with CF with normal lung function. *Thorax*. 2010;65(5):379-383.
- 7 Owens CM, Aurora P, Stanojevic S et al. Lung Clearance Index and HRCT are complementary markers of lung abnormalities in young children with CF. *Thorax*. 2011;66(6):481-488.
- 8 Gustafsson PM, De Jong PA, Tiddens HA, Lindblad A. Multiple-breath inert gas washout and spirometry versus structural lung disease in cystic fibrosis. *Thorax*. 2008;63(2):129-134.
- 9 Hall GL, Logie KM, Parsons F et al. Air Trapping on Chest CT Is Associated with Worse Ventilation Distribution in Infants with Cystic Fibrosis Diagnosed following Newborn Screening. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(8):e23932.
- 10 Hoo A-, Thia LP, Nguyen TTD et al. Lung function is abnormal in 3-month-old infants with cystic fibrosis diagnosed by newborn screening. *Thorax*. 2012;67(10):874-881.
- 11 Aurora P, Stanojevic S, Wade A et al. Lung clearance index at 4 years predicts subsequent lung function in children with cystic fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2011;183(6):752-758.
- 12 Aurora P, Bush A, Gustafsson P et al. Multiple-breath washout as a marker of lung disease in preschool children with cystic fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2005;171(3):249-256.
- 13 Gustafsson PM, Aurora P, Lindblad A. Evaluation of ventilation maldistribution as an early indicator of lung disease in children with cystic fibrosis. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2003;22(6):972-979.
- 14 Aurora P. Multiple-breath inert gas washout test and early cystic fibrosis lung disease. *Thorax*. 2010;65(5):373-374.

- 15 Vermeulen F, Proesmans M, Boon M, Havermans T, De Boeck K. Lung clearance index predicts pulmonary exacerbations in young patients with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax*. 2014;69(1):39-45.
- 16 Subbarao P, Stanojevic S, Brown M et al. Lung clearance index as an outcome measure for clinical trials in young children with cystic fibrosis. A pilot study using inhaled hypertonic saline. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;188(4):456-460.
- 17 Amin R, Subbarao P, Lou W et al. The effect of dornase alfa on ventilation inhomogeneity in patients with cystic fibrosis. *Eur Respir J*. 2011;37(4):806-812.
- 18 Davies J, Sheridan H, Bell N et al. Assessment of clinical response to ivacaftor with lung clearance index in cystic fibrosis patients with a G551D-CFTR mutation and preserved spirometry: a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet Respiratory Medicine*. 2013;1(8):630-638.
- 19 Horsley AR, Gustafsson PM, Macleod KA et al. Lung clearance index is a sensitive, repeatable and practical measure of airways disease in adults with cystic fibrosis. *Thorax*. 2008;63(2):135-140.
- 20 Verbanck S, Paiva M, Paeps E et al. Lung clearance index in adult cystic fibrosis patients: the role of convection-dependent lung units. *Eur Respir J*. 2013;42(2):380-388.
- 21 Fuchs SI, Gappa M, Eder J, Unsinn KM, Steinkamp G, Ellemunter H. Tracking Lung Clearance Index and chest CT in mild cystic fibrosis lung disease over a period of three years. *Respir Med*. 2014;108(6):865-874.
- 22 Ellemunter H, Fuchs SI, Unsinn KM et al. Sensitivity of Lung Clearance Index and chest computed tomography in early CF lung disease. *Respir Med*. 2010;104(12):1834-1842.
- 23 Rosenfeld M. An overview of endpoints for cystic fibrosis clinical trials: one size does not fit all. *Proc Am Thorac Soc*. 2007;4(4):299-301.
- 24 Simmonds NJ, D'Souza L, Roughton M, Alton EW, Davies JC, Hodson ME. Cystic fibrosis and survival to 40 years: a study of cystic fibrosis transmembrane conductance regulator function. *Eur Respir J*. 2011;37(5):1076-1082.
- 25 Subbarao P, Milla C, Aurora P et al. Multiple-Breath Washout as a Lung Function Test in Cystic Fibrosis. A Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Workshop Report. *Annals ATS*. 2015;12(6):932-939.
- 26 Horsley AR, Macleod KA, Robson AG et al. Effects of cystic fibrosis lung disease on gas mixing indices derived from alveolar slope analysis. *Respir Physiol Neurobiol*. 2008;162(3):197-203.
- 27 O'Neill K, Bradley JM, Tunney M, Elborn JS. S44 Lung clearance index (LCI) and FEV1 correlate equally with treatment burden as measured by cystic fibrosis questionnaire-revised (CFQ-R). *Thorax*. 2011;66(Suppl 4):A23-A23.

- 28 O'Neill K, Johnston E, Tunney M, Elborn JS, Bradley JM. 159 Lung Clearance Index (LCI) during and following a pulmonary exacerbation (PEx) in patients with CF. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. 2012;11, Supplement 1(0):S97.
- 29 O'Neill K, Johnston E, Tunney M, Elborn JS, Bradley JM. WS7.3 Relationships between lung clearance index (LCI), patient reported symptoms and health related quality of life (HRQoL) in CF. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. 2012;11, Supplement 1(0):S14.
- 30 Rosenstein BJ, Cutting GR. The diagnosis of cystic fibrosis: A consensus statement. *J Pediatr*. 1998;132(4):589-595.
- 31 Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V et al. Standardisation of spirometry. *European Respiratory Journal*. 2005;26(2):319-338.
- 32 Stanojevic S, Wade A, Stocks J et al. Reference Ranges for Spirometry Across All Ages. *American Journal of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine*. 2008;177(3):253-260.
- 33 Aurora P, Stanojevic S, Wade A et al. Lung Clearance Index at 4 Years Predicts Subsequent Lung Function in Children with Cystic Fibrosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2010;
- 34 Amin R, Stanojevic S, Kane M, Webster H, Ratjen F. A randomized controlled trial to evaluate the lung clearance index as an outcome measure for early phase studies in patients with cystic fibrosis. *Respir Med*. 2016;112:59-64.
- 35 Venkatraman ES. A Permutation Test to Compare Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves. *Biometrics*. 2000;56(4):1134-1138.
- 36 Bland JM, Altman DG. Statistical methods for assessing agreement between two methods of clinical measurement. *Lancet*. 1986;1(8476):307-310.
- 37 Brown M, Jensen R, Balkovec S et al. In: Anonymous *Effects Of Forced Expiratory Maneuvers And Bronchodilator On Lung Clearance Index In Infants*. American Thoracic Society; 2011:A6311-A6311.
- 38 Fuchs SI, Toussaint S, Edlhaime B, Ballmann M, Gappa M. Short-term effect of physiotherapy on variability of the lung clearance index in children with cystic fibrosis. *Pediatr Pulmonol*. 2010;45(3):301-306.
- 39 Sawicki GS, Ren CL, Konstan MW et al. Treatment complexity in cystic fibrosis: trends over time and associations with site-specific outcomes. *J Cyst Fibros*. 2013;12(5):461-467.
- 40 Quittner AL, Buu A, Messer MA, Modi AC, Watrous M. Development and validation of The Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire in the United States: a health-related quality-of-life measure for cystic fibrosis. *Chest*. 2005;128(4):2347-2354.
- 41 Singer F, Houlitz B, Latzin P, Robinson P, Gustafsson P. A realistic validation study of a new nitrogen multiple-breath washout system. *PLoS ONE*. 2012;7(4)

42 Lee TWR, Brownlee KG, Conway SP, Denton M, Littlewood JM. Evaluation of a new definition for chronic *Pseudomonas aeruginosa* infection in cystic fibrosis patients. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis*. 2003;2(1):29-34.



## Tables

Table 1: CF and HC subject characteristics

	Visit 1			Visit 1			CF subjects completing 2 visits
	Adult CF (n=67)	Adult HC (n=30)	p-value	Child CF (n=43)	Child HC (n=31)	p-value	CF (n=56) <sup>f</sup>
Median (IQR) age in years	27.0 (16.0)	27.0 (7.0)	0.82	11.7 (3.4)	10.8 (3.4)	0.32	23.5 (15.8)
n (%) F508del homozygous	21/67 (31)	n/a	n/a	19/43 (44)	n/a	n/a	20/56 (36)
n (%) chronic <i>P. aeruginosa</i> infection <sup>42</sup>	33/67 (49)	n/a	n/a	7/43 (16)	n/a	n/a	19/56 (34)
Females: males (n)	28:39	16:14	0.70	19:24	14:17	<0.0001	31:25
Mean (SD) FEV <sub>1</sub> % predicted	71.8 (20.3)	100.5 (11.0)	<0.0001	85.2 (16.6)	90.0 (12.2)	0.21	77.3 (18.9)
Mean (SD) FEV <sub>1</sub> z-score	-2.3 (1.7)	0.1 (1.0)	<0.0001	-1.2 (1.4)	-0.8 (1.0)	0.15	-1.9 (1.6)
Median (IQR) FEF <sub>25-75</sub> % predicted	40 (46.7) <sup>a</sup>	90.9 (33.32)	<0.0001	66.0 (27.6)	80.4 (23.2)	0.02	53.8 (52.0) <sup>g</sup>
Mean FEF <sub>25-75</sub> z-score	-2.4 (1.6) <sup>a</sup>	-0.4 (0.8)	<0.0001	-1.7 (1.5)	-1.0 (1.2)	0.02	-2.0 (1.7) <sup>g</sup>
Mean (SD) LCI no. turnovers [range]	10.3 (3.0) [5.9-17.2]	6.5 (0.5) [5.6-7.3]	<0.0001	7.8 (1.8) [5.4-12.9]	6.3 (0.5) [5.5-7.3]	<0.0001	9.4 (2.6)
Mean (SD) LCI z-score	7.8 (5.8)	-0.1 (1.0)	<0.0001	2.9 (3.5)	-0.3 (1.0)	<0.0001	6.0 (5.2)
Mean (SD) LCI intra-visit CV %	4.1 (2.4) <sup>b</sup>	4.5 (2.9) <sup>c</sup>	0.57	6.3 (3.0) <sup>d</sup>	4.5 (2.3) <sup>e</sup>	0.01	4.3 (3.0)

<sup>a</sup>FEF<sub>25-75</sub> data was recorded for 59/67 of adult subjects with CF.

<sup>b</sup>LCI CV% calculated from 49/67 adult CF subject data i.e. those with 3 valid and repeatable LCI readings. LCI from n=18 were calculated from two washout readings, therefore CV% not calculated.

<sup>c</sup>LCI CV% from calculated from 28/30 adult HC subject data. LCI from n=2 were calculated from two washout readings.

<sup>d</sup>LCI CV% calculated from data from 37/43 child subjects with CF. LCI from n=6 was calculated from two washout readings.

<sup>e</sup>LCI CV% from 28/31 child HC subjects. LCI from n=3 was calculated from two washout readings.

<sup>f</sup> Subject demographics at visit 1.

<sup>g</sup>FEF<sub>25-75</sub> data was recorded for 51/56 CF subjects completing 2 visits.

Table 2: LCI intra-visit repeatability data for CF adults and CF children

	Mean (SD) LCI 1st washout	Mean (SD) LCI 3rd washout	Mean difference (SD) 3 <sup>rd</sup> -1 <sup>st</sup>	CoR
CF adults (n=49)	9.8 (2.5)	10.0 (2.6)	0.2 (0.6)	1.2
CF children (n=37)	7.9 (1.9)	8.0 (1.9)	0.1 (0.7)	1.3

Table 3: Correlations between CFQ-R domain scores, LCI and spirometry in adolescent/adults (n=55) and children (n=25).

CFQ-R domains	LCI z-score		FEV <sub>1</sub> z-score		FEF <sub>25-75</sub> z-score	
	Adult	Child	Adult	Child	Adult	Child
Physical functioning	-0.18	-0.18	0.25	0.03	0.06	0.21
Role/School functioning <sup>^</sup>	-0.03	-	0.17	-	0.08	-
Vitality <sup>^</sup>	0.01	-	-0.06	-	-0.17	-
Emotion	-0.07	-0.23	0.02	0.00	-0.01	-0.08
Social functioning	-0.18	-0.33	0.15	0.16	-0.01	-0.01
Body image	-0.05	-0.26	-0.03	0.11	-0.01	0.04
Eating disturbances	0.01	-0.25	0.08	0.09	-0.02	0.11
Treatment burden	-0.37**	-0.50**	0.43**	0.44*	0.38**	0.19
Health perceptions <sup>^</sup>	-0.07	-	0.11	-	-0.05	-
Weight <sup>^</sup>	0.20	-	-0.12	-	-0.12	-
Respiratory symptoms	-0.15	-0.23	0.17	0.07	0.19	-0.01
Digestion symptoms	-0.10	-0.12	-0.07	0.15	-0.07	0.19

Correlation coefficient expressed as an r value

\*p<0.05 \*\*p<0.01

<sup>^</sup> Adolescent/adult CFQ-R domains only

## Figure legends

Figure 1 (a) and (b): Bland-Altman plot for the first and third washout repeats for (a) adult (n=49) and (b) child (n=37) CF subjects.

Figure 2 (a): CF vs. HC: Adult ROC curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub>% predicted and FEF<sub>25-75</sub>% predicted to CF compared with HC subjects.

Figure 2 (b): CF vs. HC: Child ROC Curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI, FEV<sub>1</sub>% predicted and FEF<sub>25-75</sub>% predicted to CF compared with HC subjects.

e-Figure 1: Flowchart demonstrating recruitment of CF subjects

e-Figure 2: Flowchart demonstrating recruitment of HC subjects

e-Figure 3: LCI vs. FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted in CF adults (triangles) and controls adults (circles). *The corresponding lines display the regression line for each group.*

e-Figure 4: LCI vs. FEV<sub>1</sub> % predicted in CF children (triangles) and child controls (circles). *The corresponding lines display the regression line for each group.*

e-Figure 5: LCI vs. FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted in CF adults (triangles) and adult controls (circles). *The corresponding lines display the regression line for each group.*

e-Figure 6: LCI vs. FEF<sub>25-75</sub> % predicted in CF children (triangles) and child controls (circles). *The corresponding lines display the regression line for each group.*

e-Figure 7: Adult ROC curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to Normal Vs. abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> in CF subjects.

e-Figure 8: Child ROC curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to Normal Vs. abnormal FEV<sub>1</sub> in CF subjects.

e-Figure 9: Adult ROC curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to Normal Vs. abnormal FEF 25-75 in CF subjects.

e-Figure 10: Child ROC curve demonstrating the sensitivity and specificity of LCI to Normal Vs. abnormal FEF 25-75 in CF subjects.

e-Figure 11: Relationship between CFQ-R treatment burden and LCI z-score in adults (open circles) and children (closed circles). The vertical dashed line represents the ULN for LCI z-score.

e-Figure 12: Relationship between CFQ-R treatment burden and FEV<sub>1</sub> z-score in adults (open circles) and children (closed circles). The vertical dashed line represents the LLN for FEV<sub>1</sub> z-score.